

**Appl. No. 09/828,462**  
**Amendment and Response to First Office Action**  
**January 12, 2005**

**Attny Docket No. 3184**

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-15 are pending in the application. Claims 1-9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Claims 1, 3, 4, 6 and 9 have been amended and new claims 10-15 have been added. Reconsideration of the amended application is respectfully requested.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Venkatraman (U.S. Patent No. 6,170,007) in view of Thielman (U.S. Patent No. 6,296,353). Specifically, the Examiner asserted that "it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Venkatraman et al.'s invention according to the teaching of Thielman et al., where Thielman et al. in the same field of endeavor teach the way piezoelectric print head is [sic] used instead for purpose of making the printer more robust and effective."

The limitations of the amended and new claims are not taught or suggested by Venkatraman and/or Thielman. In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert A. Vitale, Jr.  
Registration No. 32,319  
Attorney for Applicants

Dated: January 12, 2005

NIRO, SCAVONE, HALLER & NIRO  
181 West Madison Street, Suite 4600  
Chicago, Illinois 60602  
(312) 236-0733